

ITEMS

VOLUME 2 · NUMBER 3 · SEPTEMBER 1948

230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN A EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE

by Pendleton Herring

IN Europe today there is a new interest in the social sciences. Current developments abroad when viewed in the light of comparable American experience bring into sharper focus problems of common concern. "The perspective of distance," as E. F. Gay used to say, "is almost as good as the perspective of time."

What are some of the problems that a rapid visit to a number of European universities discloses? How to recruit adequate faculties, to provide sufficient courses, to find enough books, to get facilities for research—all these difficulties, familiar in American institutions, are of course aggravated many times over by lack of resources in European universities. In these terms the books and periodicals sent by the Social Science Research Council and other organizations during the past year or so have been very welcome. Material aid is helpful but there is much more in the situation than can be met in these terms. In the perspective of distance some of these less tangible factors come into view. In the notes that follow are offered one visitor's impressions gained from a six-week visit this past spring to various universities and research institutes in nine countries of Western Europe.

The social sciences are being called upon to help in the tremendous readjustment that Europe must make if it is to become a going concern. Whether the social scientists can possibly meet these calls in sufficient strength and scope is very uncertain. But that they are turned to with high expectancy may be symptomatic of significant changes in attitude. Does it reflect a more hopeful determination to seek new and less traditional ways of handling social relations? Or less reliance on hard and fast ideological or dogmatic habits of thought? Does it suggest that a more experimental mood may prevail? No conclusive evidence is possible on any of these points

and one must hasten to add that many indications emphasize the possibility of nationalistic, factional, and irrational attitudes standing in the way of orderly change.

The central fact is the necessity for rapid and profound institutional adjustment if Europe is to have a future. To say that great masses of men have had to adapt to change is to understate greatly the sufferings brought by war and tyranny and the vicissitudes of forced migrations and want. Europeans have felt the acute pangs that come from the disruption of an intricate civilized society. They are now to find their place in a postwar world that in ways, political, economic, and social, must differ greatly from the days before the war. The natural reaction of many is to restore in some measure the familiar; to seek the remembrance of things past. History weighs heavy upon the shoulders of Europeans as they arise to meet the future. What resilience they will display, what capacity for adapting behavior to changed conditions, are among the imponderables of current politics. Granting that inertia is great and tradition strong, there is a clearly discernible trend toward the social sciences as a means for analyzing the changes taking place and for providing ways of coping with the many problems in social and human relations that such changes entail. Many Europeans know that such knowledge is much more widely applied in the United States. Much that we take for granted through long familiarity is regarded abroad with fresh interest. They sense, it seems to me, more clearly than we do the extent to which the social sciences in the United States are one expression of our culture. It might be argued that a mobile, dynamic, free society is most likely to produce a group of men curious about its operations and alert to systematize

their knowledge. Certainly the necessity for change and adjustment in countries abroad is serving as a stimulus to the development of social science there.

Social scientists are being called upon to help with practical problems. In some instances the expectations may exceed the possible performance. But whatever the dangers or the failings may be, strong impulses are encouraging or forcing the application of social science findings and, under the impact of immediate necessity, important advances may be made.

APPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Here are a few illustrations of the range of problems in which one phase or another of the social sciences is being applied.

1. In Great Britain the usefulness of psychology was amply demonstrated in the selection and training of men and women for wartime service, and similar contributions from other social sciences were made in greater or less degree. Now a battle is on to increase industrial productivity and a Working Party on Research and Productivity of the Scientific Advisory Council is seeking the aid of psychologists, sociologists, economists, psychiatrists, and cultural anthropologists. A committee on industrial productivity under Sir Henry Tissard reports to Sir Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council. The committee's panel on human factors in industry brings together business men and civil servants and the working party of scientists.

2. In Norway what to do with thousands of Quislings presents serious problems. Plans are under way at the University of Oslo for a team applying the techniques of sociologists and social psychologists to work for several years on this social engineering task. Graduate students are making field studies and various psychological tests are being employed. How to relate to postwar Norwegian life thousands upon thousands of people who were disloyal during the Occupation is a question that cannot be disposed of in punitive terms or simply through traditional handling by the courts. By contrast, the reabsorbing of Japanese-Americans into American life is a simple matter.

3. In the field of industry and trade the need for statistical data and for skilled economic analysis has never been so great. Monetary controls and large-scale public enterprises require well-trained economists. In Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries economics is the most highly developed field in the social sciences, and encouraging advances are being made in Holland and Belgium. In all the Marshall Plan countries trained economists and statisticians must be used if accurate allocations and informed judgments are to be made in the administration of European recovery.

4. Still another applied field of great urgency is that of international relations. The hope of following a

policy of neutrality in foreign affairs is now virtually dead in Holland, Belgium, Norway, and Denmark. Some wishful thinking continues in Sweden, but in all these countries it is generally clear that a much wider knowledge of international relations is needed. A public understanding of foreign affairs calls for study materials, books, and learned journals, and greater use of mass media than has prevailed in the past.

5. The skills of trained students must be applied to colonial policy. The value of the Belgian Congo for Belgium's economic recovery has dramatically underscored the vital importance of this possession. On the other hand, the Dutch are dismayed at the threat to their prosperity and security involved in a loss of their colonies.

These illustrations emphasize how greatly immediate problems may influence the research man's distribution of his energies and attention. Certainly at times in the United States the advance of research has suffered from preoccupation with questions that were of great current importance and popular concern but beyond the scope of effective social science treatment. In the perspective of the present situation in Europe the need for a proper balance between trying to meet emergencies and continuing basic work is clear. Professors responsible for the training of students and the advancement of sound theoretic work are mindful of the consequences of undue emphasis on the social engineering side. For example, Swedish economists state that Sweden is living on its past reputation in economic theory and that no fresh work has taken place in recent years. Their best graduate students are drawn into government service. The opportunities for men to obtain well-paid jobs applying their economic knowledge in government and industry result in a negative selection of highly able men for university posts. A similar complaint is heard in Holland. Here the disruption in training caused by the war, plus the great current demands for technical advice in public policy and in business, mean that the limited number of trained experts must spread their energies over a wide range. Thoughtful men in all these countries are convinced that the application of social science knowledge offers the way for facts and reasoning to contribute vitally to the handling of those difficult problems central to the peace and prosperity of their countries. There are men of affairs and men of science who are bending their efforts in this direction.

There is an element of drama in this situation since suspense concerning the outcome must be high. This uncertainty rests upon the limited time and human talent at present available and the great difficulty of the tasks to be performed. These tasks are too numerous and in general outline too obvious to elaborate here.

One can see in the perspective of these European problems elements that are common both to them and to our own. In the United States we are familiar with the pressures for practical results and for applying existing knowledge, sometimes at the expense of basic research. We know also that a field may secure generous financial support in both its applied and theoretical aspects, when research can show results.

INSTITUTES FOR APPLIED RESEARCH

A fresh approach to the application of the social sciences is being worked out at the newly created Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London:

The Institute bases itself on two main principles: first that the work it does shall arise from specific requests for assistance in the solution of existing social problems; and secondly, that its role shall be one of full technical collaboration with all those concerned in a particular problem, with the Institute assuming joint responsibility for working things out to a satisfactory conclusion, rather than merely providing an "expert" opinion and retiring from the field.¹

Such principles have a strange ring to those university men who prefer to remain in their cloisters. "It has always seemed to me," said one don, "that as knowledge becomes more useful it becomes much less interesting. And, by the way," he added a few moments later, "tell me about this man Kinsey: Hasn't he been neglecting his study of wasps?" In universities such as Oxford and Cambridge a substantial readjustment has been required in order that research men who happen to be interested in what is useful may carry on empirical studies. One way to meet the problem is through the creation of separate institutes for research, as for example: at Oxford, the Institute of Experimental Psychology, the Institute of Statistics, and the Institute of Agricultural Economics; and, at Cambridge, the Institute of Applied Economics and the Psychological Laboratory.

An institute usually means a professor or two or three, with a few assistants and a modest collection of books in a special field of interest. The advantage of this arrangement is the autonomy and flexibility it offers the specialist in carrying forward his research. Such arrangements are, of course, familiar to us in the United States but they are perhaps of greater significance in European universities where the research facilities are quite limited and established traditions very strong. At the University of Oslo, Professor Frisch has gathered a small and able group in his Institute of Economics. At the

University of Stockholm there is an Institute for Social Sciences and at Uppsala institutes of economics, statistics, and sociology, respectively. In Denmark, there is the Institute of Economics and History at Copenhagen and the Institute of Economics at Aarhus; in Holland, the Dutch Economic Institute at Rotterdam and an Institute of Economics at Amsterdam. France has the Scientific Institute of Economic and Social Research at Paris and the Institute of Applied Economic Science.

These institutes serve as a bridgehead for the social science disciplines as relative newcomers within the faculties of ancient institutions. They also provide a way of resolving the debate between those who argue that the university is the "natural home of research" and those who believe that the universities are too remote from the world of affairs.

RESEARCH STIMULATION AND TRAINING

At Oxford, Nuffield College and All Souls College, each in its own distinctive fashion, contribute greatly to the stimulation of research and to the fostering of contacts with leaders outside the university. All Souls College provides a setting both in the charm of its ancient quads, lodgings, and halls and in the urbanity and distinction of its Fellows that has made it a congenial meeting place for a small but highly influential group of leaders of the British press and in public life.

Nuffield College, temporarily living in improvised quarters in a row of old dwelling houses on the Banbury Road, has brought together a group of social science research men and has also arranged research fellowships with dons from other Oxford colleges that make possible the reduction of their heavy tutoring loads and thus free half time for research. The leadership of Sir Henry Clay as the Warden of Nuffield College and as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Institute of Economic and Social Research helps to guide the course of research development. Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, as Director of the London School and as Chairman of the Interdepartmental Standing Committee also provides important direction. The close personal relations among the leading social scientists and their proximity in a few centers tend to give more cohesion than the organizational pattern suggests.

Several other items call for mention in rounding out a report of recent events. A readership in sociology has been established at Oxford during the past year. The problem now is to find an incumbent well qualified for this new post. There is some debate concerning the merits of the quantitative approach to sociological research and a tendency to sheer away from such an emphasis. Professor George Humphrey was appointed to the

¹ *The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations: A Statement of Aims and Policy* (London, 1947), p. 1.

first chair in psychology at Oxford within the last year, although the Institute of Experimental Psychology has been in existence for some time. In anthropological studies at Oxford there has always been a strong emphasis on social anthropology, and an institute in that field, under Evans Pritchard, is well under way.

Under the leadership of Nuffield College, a group of about a dozen dons from different Oxford colleges have been meeting monthly during the past year to discuss problems of politics and party organizations. They have met with various political leaders and party officials who have been invited to Oxford. There has, of course, been an interest in Great Britain extending over many years in problems of local government, and Ivor Jennings, before his departure for Ceylon, gave impetus to the study of parliamentary government. There has hitherto been virtually no study of party politics as such, but among the younger dons and graduate students this subject has now come to the front. There are probably a score or so interested in this field and in the possibilities of systematic study.

At Oxford University within the past year the new degree of B. Phil. has been established. This degree parallels in many respects the ordinary M.A. degree in the United States. It is open to men who have attained first-class honors as undergraduates and who wish to engage in more advanced work but not in original research. The D. Phil. continues to be the degree conferred for distinguished individual research, with an examination in defense of the candidate's dissertation. The B. Phil. can be attained by qualified men on the basis of a year's study. Candidates must pass a written examination. It is expected that the degree will be of particular interest to Rhodes scholars and to men from the provincial universities who wish to carry on their graduate work at Oxford. Three separate examinations have been set up for politics, economics, and philosophy, and it is hoped that the degree will be extended to other fields. The first examinations were given this past June. There were two candidates in politics and about six in economics. This development marks the closest parallel in a British university to graduate training along lines familiar in American institutions.

It is out of these varied items that a modern social science program is gradually evolving. Oxford and Cambridge are in the vanguard of such developments in British and Scottish institutions and far ahead of anything on the continent.

The facts are that today leading European universities recognize the need for more professors and for training more research men in social science fields. All this is emphasized by demands from the government and from industry, and within the university by height-

ened student interest. One professor in Norway put the problem quite directly in these terms:

The younger people are very much interested in the social sciences. This interest has come about through their desire to find some means of meeting the problems that they see about them and through their reading of United States social science literature. Their professors would like to respond to this interest but do not feel prepared to offer the necessary course instruction. They can arrange for special reading and appropriate examinations and are willing to modify degree requirements.

A chair of sociology has recently been established at the University of Oslo, where admirable work has gone forward in economics. As one professor pointed out, however, there is no formal provision for work in social psychology, political science, criminology, and the sociology of law. In Denmark there are a few able men in economics and psychology but political science is dismissed as a cocktail, a heady mixture that sober-minded scholars regard askance. In Sweden, on the other hand, political science has been an academic discipline at the University of Stockholm for many years. In Sweden also a Social Science Research Council was set up a year ago with funds from the government to be granted to the universities.

In general the desire to develop the social sciences is limited chiefly by the resources of manpower and money available. Of these two the lack of trained men is the more compelling limitation. In the meantime, arrangements have been made in several institutions to invite scholars from the United States to lecture in social psychology, social history, statistics, and economics. Many professors and graduate students would welcome an opportunity to study or teach in American universities. There is a great interest in learning more about the fields where notable advances have been made in theory or in methodology. For example, the recent developments in social anthropology in the United States have attracted considerable interest in Great Britain.

There the Colonial Office has recently set up a Social Science Research Council and is seeking qualified university scientists to help both in the establishment of university colleges in British colonies and in the conduct of research projects. A current memorandum issued by this Council states that

From the time of its inception the Council has given much thought to the question of priorities in social science research and to the preparation of research programmes in different parts of the Colonial Empire. The need for some kind of "short list" of urgent research projects is rendered all the more necessary by the acute shortage of qualified and experienced re-

search workers and the possibility that provision may have to be made to overcome this shortage by the institution of training schemes.²

Indeed the need for qualified men is so acute that the Colonial Office has been authorized to spend dollars for the employment of American social scientists if men can be found who are willing to serve in the new university colleges being organized and to engage in the economic and sociological projects being planned. Indicative of the kind of studies of pressing urgency are socioeconomic surveys of various African cultural differentiations in Gambia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and the Gold Coast. Studies of labor marketing, land tenure, the effects of propaganda, labor migration, farming practice, and comparative studies of village communities are projected. In its memorandum the Council recognizes that

While it is natural that governments should give highest priority to those research projects with an economic trend which will aid the solution of pressing problems, the need for the study of long range social problems—e.g. changing family structure—should not be overlooked, since they may be fundamental in understanding refractory social situations.

FINANCING OF RESEARCH

The perspective of distance brings to attention some of the questions raised by the dependence upon governmental aid for financing research. Here the most pertinent experience is that of Great Britain. In July 1946 the *Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research* appeared.³ Sir John Clapham was the committee chairman and the report is commonly identified by his name. Among the members were Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Sir Henry Clay, Sir Hector Hetherington, and Professors L. Robbins and R. H. Tawney. The report of this committee has been the occasion for considerable debate ever since its publication. The committee noted that "the number of universities in which there exists continuous provision for research in social questions is still extremely small. Yet the prospects of tangible return in national welfare are at least as great in the social as in the natural sciences." The committee developed the point that "in modern countries the exigencies of day to day administration necessitate the collection of exact information on a vast range of matters relevant to the social sciences." The in-

sufficiency of university resources to meet the need for the conduct of research and for the training of personnel was frankly faced. As of 1938-39 the committee found that "If the number of full-time professors and readers be taken as a criterion, we find that in the universities and university colleges of Great Britain there were some 52 of these posts in the social sciences, whereas in pure science there were 296 and 176 in medicine." The committee likewise stressed the need for increased research funds and reported, "The more realistic and practical the work becomes, the more it involves processes of collection and analysis which necessarily involve considerable outlay."

Criticism of the Clapham report has been directed not at its diagnosis but rather at its recommendations. They urged that a standing interdepartmental economic and social research committee be set up to advise upon research in government departments and that more large government grants be made to the universities, but the committee advised against the establishment of an official social science research council with the warning that "the social sciences, although large in promise, have not yet reached the stage at which such an official body could be brought into operation without danger of a premature crystallization of spurious orthodoxies." It felt that there was not a "sufficiency of collaborators" to warrant the creation of a formal body for coordination of research plans. In general the Clapham report supported the status quo.

This means that the University Grants Committee remains in command. This committee has operated in such a way as to leave virtually complete control in the hands of university authorities over the allotment of government funds for educational purposes within the universities. Should an official social science research council be established, with public funds to disburse, a tighter and more centralized control of government research funds is feared. There is some apprehension in certain university quarters that promotion of such a scheme at this time would give the Labor Government more influence in university affairs than some academic leaders would like to see. The universities are already dependent upon the national government for about a third of their financial support. There are many academic leaders who would not like to see this trend carried any further at the present time. On the other hand, it is recognized that the only adequate source of support for educational purposes is parliament.

In December 1946 the Association of Scientific Workers, a trade union with a membership of 18,000 drawn from both the natural and social sciences, established a Social Sciences Committee. The leaders of the union are definitely of the "left wing" as are several members

² "Research Priorities in West Africa: Memorandum by the Colonial Social Science Research Council" (mimeographed, 3 pp.).

³ Privy Council Office, Treasury, *Report of the Committee* . . . Cmd. 6868 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1946). The quotations from this report, in the order of their occurrence in this and the following paragraphs, are from pp. 4, 4, 7, 9, and 12, respectively.

of the committee, which has recently published a memorandum presenting the case for greater use of the social sciences.⁴ The members of this committee are for the most part a younger group and they differ in their views from the Clapham committee in at least one major respect. "In our judgment," they state, "there is urgent need for a body for purposes of organising, stimulating and financing of research in the social field. We believe that the most suitable agency for this purpose would be a Social Sciences Research Council responsible to the Lord President." This council would survey research needs and areas, establish priorities, and provide funds. The committee feels that more could be done with the admittedly inadequate number of qualified men, particularly by the promotion and encouragement of "persons who show promise rather than wait for those who have reached 'chronological' maturity." It places less emphasis upon the universities as the "natural home of research" than did the Clapham committee:

... We believe that social science research should be expanded wherever it is going on. Thought upon the working and development of human institutions should be closely linked with social action. The intellectual ferment which characterizes university departments at their best should be made possible in government departments.

These direct quotations from the two reports reflect the different spirit in which the problem of social science organization and development is being viewed in Great Britain today, and present in somewhat sharper perspective an issue which we do not have to face in such definite fashion in the United States.

CONTRASTING RESEARCH SITUATIONS

Our Social Science Research Council has been operating for 25 years and has acquired much experience in the planning and promoting of research activities. It has the cooperation of the members of the several social science associations. Private financial support and diversified university facilities provide a broad basis for the work in progress. Social scientists have received research grants from various federal agencies and it may be that the resources available have not been fully exploited. The important point is that within the last decade or so a very substantial foundation has been built for social science activities in the United States. Its full extent is best appreciated by a comparative view.

Most striking is the contrast between social science

research and its institutional support, particularly by our universities and philanthropic foundations, and the small group of able social scientists in Europe and their concomitant institutional and public support. For social science research and social engineering to develop in Europe with anything like the scope required calls for very rapid advances indeed. The need for social science development, however, is gaining recognition. Public subsidies will be necessary and their impact is likely to differ, in degree at least, from the effect of government aid on parallel developments in this country.

What are the reasons for this great difference between the United States and Europe in the development of fields of learning dealing with social, economic, and political relations? It is obviously due in part to the war, but the full explanation probably lies much deeper and would call for a rather basic analysis of historical factors and cultural differences. Concepts concerning the nature of education and the role of the scholar would have to be considered. Economic and philosophical values would have a place in such study. What is it that produces in a society a wide and eclectic inquisitiveness about its operations? Why are some men attracted by empirical investigations and ready, at least for purposes of a particular factual survey, to subordinate normative imponderables? Why do some societies seem to produce more statisticians than philosophers?

A question that remains unresolved in some quarters abroad is: What kind of society is most conducive to scientific advance? One gains the impression that this is a topic of discussion more often on the part of certain groups of natural scientists than of those in the social sciences. The answer to this question, in so far as the social sciences are concerned, was made tragically clear in the German universities.

Today virtually nothing of significance in the social science fields remains in German universities. The task of rebuilding these subjects is tremendous and is being approached by the Democratization Branch of the Office of Military Government. Plans are under way for projects on topics such as civil liberties, democratization of the German Civil Service, federalism, political parties and electoral systems, child guidance and counseling services. There are plans under discussion for training public administrators and for schools of politics. These are educational rather than research projects and involve broad cultural interchange and expert advice to special groups as well as general public forums.

French universities have suffered lamentably and it remains to be seen how much of a break with traditional patterns of organization their rehabilitation will bring. Graduate training in the social fields has predominantly

⁴ *The Social Sciences: A Case for Their Greater Use* (London: Association of Scientific Workers, 1948). The quotations from this report are from pp. 36, 23, and 30, respectively.

been within the law faculties of these universities. This has obviously had quite a limiting effect on a field such as economics. Most encouragement for the study of politics and administration has come through the establishment of special institutes outside the existing system of faculty jurisdictions. In essence, European educational institutions face the need for a rapid adjustment of their resources and academic routines in order to respond to student demands and national needs for social science training. This imbalance goes back before the war and is basically explained by value systems that accorded prestige and rewards to men trained in the law, the classics and humanities, and the natural sciences. European universities, for quite understandable historical reasons, were not organized to provide facilities or recognition to these newer fields of inquiry.

Assuming governmental regimes that permit freedom of inquiry, the problem is to break sufficiently with the past to permit organizational changes appropriate to social science development. This may likewise result in increasing the career possibilities for able research men. In the smaller European countries the competition for professorial posts has been keen and candidates who lose out may have no other opportunities. In this sense, the growth of European intellectual and scientific unity and a wider basis for the educational and research structure would mean for scholars and scientists not only freedom but opportunity.

In the future, research careers may also be found in international agencies. UNESCO is now making better progress with its social science program and has secured the cooperation of social scientists in various countries. Some preliminary work on its study of Tensions Affecting International Understanding has been arranged with research men in 18 nations. Of particular significance

is the work of the Economic Commission for Europe where a strong technical staff has already demonstrated its quality in its recent Survey of the Economic Situation and Prospects of Europe. Economic experts and technicians from various European countries have worked together very effectively on the committees of the ECE. But there are simply not enough trained men to meet the many needs incident to European recovery.

Viewed from a European angle, the training of research personnel appears especially urgent. Here, again, we have a problem in common. Its resolution, both in this country and abroad, calls for adjustments within the universities and further help from the outside. The training of research personnel in the social sciences in European universities may probably best be met through concentrating resources at a few key spots where good work is already under way. It cannot be undertaken on as large a scale or as wide a front as in the United States. Collaboration between such European centers and American institutions seems feasible.

The assistance that we have already extended by sending books and periodicals, and by the limited exchange of scholars, has an influence that goes far beyond the material aspects. One effect is to reaffirm the international fellowship of the scientific world. The many professors in European universities who know and understand this country are the present-day counterpart of that generation of American scholars who brought home from their student days or their sabbatical years spent in British or continental universities an appreciation of European science and scholarship. Many men in European universities today look to the United States with the same interest and expectancy with which a previous generation of American professors looked abroad.

THE 1948 MEETING OF THE CANADIAN SSRC

by Harold E. Jones

IN AN EARLIER number of *Items* (September 1947) Dr. A. T. Poffenberger described the organization of the Canadian Social Science Research Council, and reported the activities of the annual meeting which was held at Laval University in Quebec, in May 1947.

The University of British Columbia was the host of the 1948 meeting, held June 12-13. During the same or the following week sessions were also scheduled in Vancouver for the National Conference of Canadian Universities, the Canadian Historical Association, the Cana-

dian Political Science Association (which includes economics, anthropology, and sociology as well as political science), and a number of additional groups from the natural sciences and the humanities.

As a result of flooded conditions in the northwest, Vancouver was not easy to reach at this time either by train or car. In spite of serious interruptions in travel, a large attendance was registered at the various meetings. In welcoming his visitors, President Norman MacKenzie of the University of British Columbia stated that

"an increasing number of national bodies of all kinds have come to meet from time to time in the different sections of Canada in order that they may see their own interests in the light of the national interest and development." It is apparent that the problem of regional and cultural separation, as great or even greater in Canada than in the United States, is fully recognized and that steps are being taken to meet it. It is obviously difficult for scientists in the various parts of Canada to keep a working contact with each other, but the Canadian SSRC, founded in 1940, is doing its full share to maintain these relationships among the social sciences.

The Council meetings were under the chairmanship of Professor J. A. Corry of Queen's University (Kingston), with the Secretary's reports by Dr. J. E. Robbins of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (Ottawa). During the past three years one of the major enterprises of the Council has been a study of various aspects of Social Credit, in the Province of Alberta. Research grants have been allocated for the general direction of this project and for some 12 or 13 individual participants. Two reports are now ready for publication, and six additional manuscripts are in preparation at the present time.

The pattern of the Social Credit study, involving a considerable degree of central planning, with specific problems allocated to investigators in various institutions, has apparently been a successful one and is to be continued in the "French-English Project," for which a preliminary grant has been obtained from the Carnegie Corporation. This project is concerned with some of the problems involved in the bicultural origins of the Canadian population. The religio-philosophical bases of the two cultures will be studied and the political accommodation of the two groups to each other; a demographic study is also being planned, to consider population growth and change, and problems arising from migration and displacement.

In addition to major projects such as the above, the functions of the Canadian Council include the award of junior and senior fellowships, arrangements for leaves

and exchange teaching, the preparation of research summaries, grants-in-aid of individual research projects, and assistance in publication.

The fellowship program, begun in 1947 with a small number of appointments, resulted in so many promising applications that an extension of the program to ten or more annual appointments is now under discussion, subject to the availability of funds. The grant-in-aid program is operated on a basis similar to that of the Council in the United States, with awards to individual scholars ranging from \$200 to \$1,000. The studies subsidized have dealt chiefly with Canadian economic, historical, and geographic problems but have included also such topics as the psychology of learning, Indian education, and researches in European history. Unlike our own Council, the Canadian SSRC has followed the policy of making specific grants not only for research but also for publication; this is in view of the somewhat greater difficulty of Canadian scholars in obtaining satisfactory publication. Rapidly mounting costs in this connection have led to rather serious budgetary problems.

The concluding meeting of the Council involved a general discussion of the research needs of the social sciences, with particular regard to the question of how far social research should be subordinated to immediate practical needs. The view was expressed, by a correspondent, that greater priority should be given to applied social science, and this led to the very vigorous statement of a counter proposition that scholarly research studies in the social sciences must maintain their independence of merely contemporary emergencies. It was the consensus of opinion that the present policies of the Council should be continued. These policies involve an appropriate concern with basic science and with the method and spirit of scientific inquiry. It is clear, however, that the Council (like our own) is in direct contact with many immediate social problems, and that in the future this contact may be increased without altering a primary commitment to the long-term interests of the social sciences.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ECONOMIC HISTORY

Arthur H. Cole (chairman), Earl J. Hamilton, Herbert Heaton, John G. B. Hutchins, Harold A. Innis, Leland H. Jenks, Edward C. Kirkland, Frederic C. Lane, Robert Warren.

Revolution in Glassmaking: Entrepreneurship and Technological Change in the American Industry, 1880-1920 by Warren C. Scoville was published in June under the auspices of the committee, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Committee on Techno-

logical Change. This volume is an examination of the relationship between entrepreneurship and inventors in the glassmaking industry of Toledo, and is the committee's first major publication in one of its two primary fields of interest—entrepreneurial history. A second publication sponsored by the committee also appeared in June, two volumes entitled *Men, Cities, and Transportation: A Study in New England History, 1820-1900* by Edward C. Kirkland. The researches reported in these volumes were not originally undertaken as part of the committee's program but they

relate to both of its major interests, the influence of government and the impact of entrepreneurs upon American economic development. The committee has accepted for publication another study which was not initiated under its auspices but which is concerned with both governmental action and the activities of individual entrepreneurs. The study is entitled "Steamboating on the Western Rivers" and is the work of Louis C. Hunter.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

J. Douglas Brown (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle, Dale Yoder; *staff*, Paul Webbink.

A fourth annual Conference on Research and Training in Industrial Relations, sponsored jointly by the committee and the University of Minnesota, was held in Minneapolis on May 20-21. Two of the three major conference topics concerned research areas and techniques, while the third was related to problems of curricula and materials in short-term courses and conferences for management and union leaders. Discussion of the first of the research areas, that of alternative frameworks for analysis of labor-management relations, led to several tentative conclusions concerning the comparability and interrelationship of particular approaches and their usefulness in analyzing patterns of industrial relations. The second research area was concerned with the determinants of workers' choices in a local labor market; the results of investigations by the Yale University Labor and Management Center were analyzed and discussed in terms of research results as well as of the significance of the techniques utilized.

Continuing the series of pamphlets which the committee has sponsored, the Council will publish in the early fall a statement on "Demands for Labor: Opportunities for Research" by Dale Yoder, and a report by Lloyd G. Reynolds on a second conference on wage research which was held under the committee's auspices last February.

MEASUREMENT OF OPINION, ATTITUDES AND CONSUMER WANTS

(Joint with the National Research Council)

Samuel A. Stouffer (chairman), S. S. Wilks (vice-chairman), P. G. Agnew, Edward Battey, Hadley Cantril, Archibald M. Crossley, W. Edwards Deming, Robert F. Elder, George Gallup, Philip M. Hauser, Carl I. Hovland, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Rensis Likert, Darrell B. Lucas, Elmo Roper, Walter A. Shewhart, Frank Stanton, C. L. Warwick; *staff*, Elbridge Sibley, Frederick F. Stephan, Philip J. McCarthy.

The committee's studies in sampling which were initiated in the fall of 1946 are nearing completion under the direction of Frederick F. Stephan. It is expected that a draft of the final report will be ready for review by the advisory subcommittee on sampling studies by the end of the summer.

The advisory subcommittee for the research project on

isolation, measurement, and control of interviewer effect, which is being carried on by the National Opinion Research Center under the direction of Clyde W. Hart, met in the New York offices of the Council on July 14. Herbert Hyman of the staff of the Center reported on progress made in the study of interviewer bias and other effects. The first approach to this problem was an analysis of data resulting from past surveys. It was possible to compare the results obtained by male and female interviewers on several questions in which the interviewer's sex might be expected to influence the responses. Other data were analyzed in which the attitude of the interviewer appeared to make a difference in the responses obtained. A number of methodological problems connected with this type of comparison were considered.

A second approach has been the interviewing of interviewers, which has brought to light a number of significant differences between individuals in their approach to respondents and in their methods of conducting their interviews. A third approach that is being used is to examine surveys that are repeated with the same respondents, to determine the extent to which the differences in responses on the second survey may be interpreted as accounted for by a change of interviewers. Here the comparison is made between those respondents who were questioned by the same interviewer on both surveys and those who were interviewed by different persons on the two surveys. Again, a number of methodological difficulties were considered. Still another approach through deliberately planned experiments was discussed, looking to the launching of one or more such experiments as opportunities arise in the future.

The advisory subcommittee for the study of the use of panels, which is being conducted at the Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research under the direction of Paul F. Lazarsfeld, met on July 15 at the New York offices of the Council. Progress was reported in the preparation of an extensive bibliography and in reviewing the operations of typical research organizations that maintain panels of respondents for survey purposes. A distinction was made between use of a panel to provide a ready source of respondents and the use of a panel for purposes of analyzing changes in attitudes and preferences between successive interviews of the same person. The project is primarily interested in the possibilities of using panels for the latter purpose. Methods of analyzing the results of repeated interviewing of the same persons, in order to trace the influence of various factors that may have brought about the shifts in opinions and preferences, were discussed. A related problem of analyzing changes in opinion for several questions on which the respondent held an inconsistent position at the time of the first interview was considered.

The project is conducting a panel study in a small city, in cooperation with several other research organizations. This study affords opportunities to test techniques for measuring changes in political opinion during a period when marked fluctuations may take place.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Clark Kerr (chairman), Paul A. Dodd, Maurice I. Gershenson, Robert D. Gray, William S. Hopkins, John P. Troxell, Edgar L. Warren.

Since the fall of 1947 the committee has followed the policy of scheduling meetings at the various West Coast research centers so that their staff members can participate in discussions of research in progress. Accordingly, a two-day meeting was held in Los Angeles in the spring to review industrial relations research projects being conducted in that area. A session held at the Industrial Relations Section of the California Institute of Technology was concerned primarily with the surveys of personnel practices and employee attitudes under way at that institution. The research activities of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California were discussed at a second session held on that campus. Similar meetings were scheduled to be held at the Stanford University Division of Industrial Relations in August and a third at the University of Washington Institute of Labor Economics in the fall. A memorandum describing the organization and programs of the several West Coast research centers is being published for the committee by the Stanford Division of Industrial Relations.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON PRICE POLICIES

Leonard A. Doyle (chairman), J. S. Bain, Ralph Cassady, Jr., E. T. Grether, John A. Guthrie, Roy W. Jastram, Vernon A. Mund, Robert B. Pettengill.

Edward S. Mason of Harvard University served as consultant for the committee's meeting in Berkeley on May 13-15, and was the principal speaker at a session on business price policy and economic stability. Other sessions were devoted to advertising policy, with an address by Roy W. Jastram; recent anti-trust decisions, with Thomas McCarthy of Permanente Metals conducting the discussion; an analysis of open markets by Vernon A. Mund; and a discussion of wage and price problems in the pulp and paper industry, by Clark Kerr and John A. Guthrie. Plans were made for another meeting in September and for extending the committee's interests beyond the primarily economic aspects of price policies.

Two papers presented at the committee's meetings in September 1947 have been published: "Prices and Wages under Bilateral Monopoly" by W. J. Fellner in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for August 1947, and "Short-Period Price Determination in Theory and Practice" by R. A. Gordon in the *American Economic Review* for June 1948.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

Davis McEntire (chairman), Maurice I. Gershenson, George M. Kuznets, William Robinson, Calvin F. Schmid, Dorothy S. Thomas.

Harold E. Jones, the Council's Pacific Coast Representative, reports that the conference sponsored by the committee in Seattle on June 7-8 was the first general meeting of social statisticians in the state of Washington. The committee's decision to bring them together for discussion of new developments, needs, and problems of common interest was inspired by the rather novel and significant developments in social statistical work which are taking place in that state, with relatively little communication among the different agencies involved. Calvin F. Schmid prepared the program for the conference which was attended by 32 guests, representing state and federal agencies, departments of the University and Washington State College, and private organizations. Discussions focused on statistical techniques, problems of the Washington Public Opinion Laboratory, procedures in a housing market survey, and the proposed state-wide system of statistical areas and census tracts. One session heard a report by Paul F. Lazarsfeld on the work of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University, with special reference to new developments in statistical and other research techniques. A final session considered the training of social statisticians.

PERSONNEL

ADMINISTRATION OF COUNCIL FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS-IN-AID

Administration of all fellowships and grants-in-aid has been transferred to the Washington office of the Council where these programs will be directed by Elbridge Sibley, Executive Associate. All inquiries and correspondence relating to research training fellowships, area fellowships and travel grants, and grants-in-aid of research should be addressed to

Elbridge Sibley
726 Jackson Place, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

A new circular announcing the *research training fellowships* offered for the coming year is being distributed. Significant changes from previous fellowship offerings of the Council were indicated in a note on page 10 of the June issue of *Items*.

The same mailing includes an announcement of the annual offering of *grants-in-aid of research*. These grants, normally limited to \$1,000 and available only to mature scholars who are not candidates for degrees, will be awarded in the spring of 1949. The closing date for applications will be January 15, 1949.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AWARDED

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Fred Eggan, Glen Heathers, Philip E. Mosely, Elbridge Sibley, and Paul Webbink—met on June 23 for consideration of the applications for research training fellowships received since its April meeting. The

following 10 appointments include the awards made at that meeting and by mail vote between recent meetings:

- Stanley K. Bigman, M.A. Columbia University, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, Sociology, for research on the extent to which the American system of a free press is utilized to offer divergent points of view
- Peter M. Blau, B.A. Elmhurst College, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, Sociology, for empirical study of white collar workers in public and private bureaucracy
- Franklin M. Bridge, M.A. Northwestern University, Ph.D. candidate Northwestern University, Government, for research on the making of public policy in the Indiana General Assembly
- Edward H. Buehrig, Ph.D. University of Chicago, International Relations, for interdisciplinary work and study of the balance of power concept, at the Institute for Advanced Study
- Chris D. Calsoyas, B.A. University of California, Ph.D. candidate University of California, Economics, for research on theories and policies of industrial location in the Soviet Union.
- Mark H. Curtis, M.A. Yale University, Ph.D. candidate Yale University, History, for study of the role of the universities in English intellectual life, 1559-1642
- Gilbert W. Nutter, B.A. University of Chicago, Ph.D. candidate University of Chicago, Economics, for exploratory study of the problem of quantifying the extent and growth of effective enterprise monopoly in the United States, 1900-1939
- William N. Parker, M.A. Harvard University, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Economics, for research on certain aspects of the economic basis of French policies on German reconstruction
- John H. Rohrer, Ph.D. State University of Iowa, Psychology, for training for research on the role of contemporary United States culture in the development of personality differences
- Lloyd Ulman, M.A. University of Wisconsin, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Economics, for research on the development of the national union, 1880-1900

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAVEL GRANTS

The Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships—Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Cora Du Bois, Merle Fainsod, Robert B. Hall, Thorsten Sellin, Charles Wagley, and Walter L. Wright, Jr.—met on May 16 to consider the first group of applications for the area research fellowships and travel grants, which were announced in the March issue of *Items*. The 26 predoctoral and 16 postdoctoral fellowship applications considered represented 21 institutions, 10 disciplines, and 8 of the major world areas. Fourteen awards have been made thus far, including one to John E. de Young as announced in the March *Items*. The 13 new appointments are as follows:

- Ernest C. Dawn, M.A. Princeton University, Ph.D. candidate Princeton University, Oriental Language, for study of Greater Syria and its implications for Arab unity
- John D. Eyre, M.A. University of Michigan, Ph.D. candidate University of Michigan, Geography, for

- library investigation and field research into the genesis and morphology of Japanese cities
- Morton H. Fried, B.S.S. College of the City of New York, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, Anthropology, for further investigation of cultural change in China with focus on a marketing town (Ch'u Hsien) and possibly a mining town (Su Chou fu)
- Thomas T. Hammond, M.A. University of North Carolina, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, History, for study of the development of Lenin's position on the role and tactics of trade-unions
- James W. Morley, M.A. School of Advanced International Studies, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, History, for a year's residence in Japan to carry on research on modern Japanese foreign relations
- Rhoads Murphey, M.A. Harvard University, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Economic Geography, for graduate study and research on rural economic organization in China
- Thomas W. Palmer, Jr., M.A. Columbia University, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, History, for research in Brazil on the conflict over state's rights between São Paulo and the Brazilian federal government
- Richard L. Park, M.A. Harvard University, Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, Political Science, for a study of political behavior of the Bengal Congress Committee of the All-India Congress Party
- Michael B. Petrovich, M.A. Columbia University, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, History, for a study of the emergence of Russian Pan Slavism
- David Rodnick, Ph.D. University of Pennsylvania, Anthropology, for a study of the patterns of behavior of Czech and Slovak cultures and their influence on Czech and Slovak personalities
- Elman R. Service, B.A. University of Michigan, Ph.D. candidate Columbia University, Anthropology, for field study of the culture of modern Paraguay
- Lawrence M. Sommers, Ph.M. University of Wisconsin, Ph.D. candidate Northwestern University, Geography, for study of geographical implications of recent trends in the Norwegian fishing industry
- Robert E. Ward, M.A. University of California, Ph.D. candidate University of Michigan, Political Science, for a study of the structure and functions of local government in postwar Japan, with particular reference to selected units of local government in the Inland Sea Region

The 19 applicants for area travel grants represented 14 institutions, 8 disciplines, and 5 world areas. The following 9 awards have been made:

- Ralph L. Beals, Professor of Anthropology, University of California at Los Angeles, for a study of acculturation processes of the Andean Indians
- Sula Benet, Instructor, Hunter College, for a study of family life and social structure of the Polish peasants
- Richard N. Frye, Junior Fellow, Society of Fellows, Harvard University, for travel to Iran
- Ernest R. Moore, Professor of Romance Languages, Syracuse University, for an interdisciplinary project in area research on Costa Rica
- Earl H. Pritchard, Visiting Associate Professor of Far Eastern History, University of Chicago, for a study of Sino-foreign relations 1514-1834
- Robert Redfield, Professor of Anthropology, University of Chicago, to investigate social science research in

China and to help organize a Department of Anthropology at Tsinghua University
 Lauriston Sharp, Professor of Anthropology, Cornell University, for a community research project on Siam
 H. Arthur Steiner, Professor of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles, for a field research project in contemporary Chinese politics
 Glenn T. Trewartha, Professor of Geography, University of Wisconsin, for an investigation of the distribution and functions of Chinese cities

The area research training fellowships and travel grants are described in a circular which was distributed last spring. Applications for awards to be made in November should be filed before October 1. Applications for field research or travel to begin at any time during the calendar year 1949 may be considered at the November meeting of the administrative committee.

The area research training fellowships are for students who intend to specialize in particular area research. The applicant's background training, the area research nature of his project, and his intent to continue specializing in the area are all given serious consideration. The travel grants are for established area specialists, to enable them to continue field work. The grants are normally limited to actual travel costs, and are never intended to finance total projects. Requests for announcements of the programs and further information should be addressed to Elbridge Sibley, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

JOINT FELLOWSHIPS IN NATURAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

The joint Fellowship Board of the NRC and SSRC has made two awards under their newly established joint fellowship program. As announced in the December issue of *Items*, these fellowships are designed to provide for supplementing the research equipment of natural scientists with training in the techniques of a related field of social science, or for supplementing social scientists' training with work in a related natural science field. The following fellows have been appointed:

Ansley J. Coale, Ph.D. Princeton University, Economics, for training in physics and mathematics at Princeton University and the Institute for Advanced Study
 Paul Mandelstam, M.A. Harvard University, Government, M.D. and Ph.D. candidate Harvard University, for training in psychiatry as an aid to research on political ideas and methods

The members of the joint Fellowship Board are Hugh S. Taylor (chairman), Detlev W. Bronk, Carlyle Jacobsen, Robert K. Merton, Edwin G. Nourse, J. Robert Oppen-

heimer, and Donald Young. Requests for information concerning the fellowships should be addressed to the Board at the Fellowship Office of the National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D.C.

COUNCIL OFFICERS

As announced in the June issue of *Items*, Pendleton Herring took office as President of the Council on June 15. Paul Webbink, who has been named Vice-President after serving as director of the Washington office of the Council for the past four years, is now located in the New York office.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS

- The Labor Force in the United States 1890-1960* by John D. Durand. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948. Pp. 302. \$2.50.
American Opinion on World Affairs in the Atomic Age by Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. and Sylvia Eberhart. Based on a report prepared for the Council's former Committee on Social Aspects of Atomic Energy. Foreword by Frederick Osborn. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp. 173. \$2.50.
Men, Cities, and Transportation: A Study in New England History, 1820-1900 by Edward C. Kirkland. Published in cooperation with the Committee on Economic History. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. 2 volumes. Pp. 1052. \$12.50.
Revolution in Glassmaking: Entrepreneurship and Technological Change in the American Industry, 1880-1920 by Warren C. Scoville. Prepared under the direction of the Committee on Economic History in collaboration with the Committee on Technological Change, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. Pp. 415. \$5.00.

SSRC BULLETIN AND PAMPHLET SERIES

- The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Social Scientists*, Bulletin 58, by Elbridge Sibley. June 1948. Pp. 178. \$1.50.
Social Adjustment in Old Age: A Research Planning Report, Bulletin 59, by Otto Pollak with the assistance of Glen Heathers. August 1948. Pp. 210. \$1.75.
Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas, Pamphlet 6, by Charles Wagley. June 1948. Pp. 63. 75 cents.

All numbers in the Council's bulletin and pamphlet series are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1948: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, JAMES C. BONBRIGHT, E. W. BURGESS, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., JOSEPH S. DAVIS, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FREDERICK S. DUNN, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, SHELBY M. HARRISON, PENDLETON HERRING, CARL I. HOVLAND, HAROLD A. INNIS, CHARLES E. MERRIAM, ROY F. NICHOLS, WILLARD C. OLSON, J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, FREDERICK OSBORN, A. T. POFFENBERGER, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, BLAIR STEWART, WILLIAM DUNCAN STRONG, WILLARD L. THORP, RALPH W. TYLER, S. S. WILKS, KIMBALL YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; ELEANOR C. ISBELL, CHARLES WAGLEY; GERALD BREESE; JOHN G. TURNBULL; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*